REMARKS

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brotman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,967) (hereinafter "Brotman") in view of Ohmori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,885,990) (hereinafter "Ohmori"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Brotman "does not explicitly teach wherein when a plurality of object words that are the same or similar to each other are recognized by said recognition means, a limiting word for distinguishing between said plurality of object words is automatically sampled from said spot information memory means at the highest level of said level structure that is capable of uniquely determining an object word from said plurality of object words and stored as an object word corresponding to said limiting word in said storage means." However, the Examiner goes on to allege that these features are "old and well known in the art as evidenced by Ohmori ..." The assertions in the Office Action in this regard are respectfully traversed for at least the foregoing reasons.

The Office Action refers to col. 26, lines 46-57, for example, of Ohmori in support of it's above-discussed assertions that Ohmori cures the deficiencies of Brotman. However, Applicant respectfully submits that this portion of Ohmori merely describes an example of an information data base that is hierarchically structured. Applicant respectfully submits that this teaching in Ohmori does not correspond to at least the claimed feature of "a limiting word for distinguishing between said plurality of object words is automatically sampled from said spot information memory means at the highest level of said level structure that is capable of uniquely determining an object word from said plurality of object words and stored as an object word corresponding to

said limiting word in said storage means." A detailed explanation of the advantages of features of the instant application's claims was set forth at pages 10-12 of the Amendment originally filed on August 16, 2006 in this application.

Applicant respectfully submits that, in Ohmori, a recognition result adjustment unit 113 extracts those attribute value candidates based on each attribute value and its recognition likelihood and narrows a number of words based on the result of the extraction. See col. 41, lines 43-60 of Ohmori. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the extracting method based on the recognition likelihood, as disclosed in Ohmori, does not correspond to the above-described features of independent claim 1 of the instant application.

Similar features are described in each of the remaining independent claims 2 and 7-10 of the instant application. Accordingly, similar arguments as discussed above with regard to independent claim 1 also apply to the remaining independent claims 2 and 7-10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Brotman nor Ohmori, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 2 and 7-10. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 1, 2, 9 or 10 and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: February 28, 2007 By: _____

Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 55694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465